

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE  
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING  
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals**

The State, Respondent,

v.

Charles Brett Walshaw, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2011-190811

---

Appeal From York County  
John C. Hayes, III, Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2013-UP-168  
Submitted March 1, 2013 – Filed April 24, 2013

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Appellate Defender Dayne C. Phillips, of Columbia, for  
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Chief Deputy  
Attorney General John W. McIntosh, Senior Assistant  
Deputy Attorney General Salley W. Elliott, and Assistant  
Attorney General Mark Reynolds Farthing, all of  
Columbia; and Solicitor Kevin S. Brackett, of York, for  
Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Sheppard*, 391 S.C. 415, 420-21, 706 S.E.2d 16, 19 (2011) ("Our law is clear that a party must make a contemporaneous objection that is ruled upon by the trial judge to preserve an issue for appellate review."); *id.* at 421, 706 S.E.2d at 19 (noting constitutional claims are not preserved for review without a contemporaneous objection at trial (citing *State v. Owens*, 378 S.C. 636, 638, 664 S.E.2d 80, 81 (2008))); *State v. Vang*, 353 S.C. 78, 85, 577 S.E.2d 225, 228 (Ct. App. 2003) (finding the defendant failed to preserve the issue of whether the jury prematurely deliberated because the defendant neither asked the trial court to individually question the jurors, nor failed to object to the trial court's ruling, after receiving a note from the jury and questioning the jury foreman, that further inquiry was unnecessary).

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>1</sup>

**SHORT, THOMAS, and PIEPER, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.